DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 501 SP 016 300

AUTHOR Zeichner, Kenneth M.
TITLE Key Processes in the Socialization of Student Teachers: Limitations and Consequences of Oversocialized Conceptions of Teacher Socialization.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 55p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Change: Cooperating Teachers: *Individual Development: Institutional Characteristics: Peer Influence: *Role Models: *Socialization: *Student Teachers: Student Teacher Supervisors: Teacher Attitudes: Teacher Education: *Vocational Adjustment

ABSTRACT

Two differing viewpoints on the socialization of student teachers are presented in this review of the literature on the subject. The functionalist view places the student teacher in a passive role, shaped by childhood experiences, and influenced by peers, pupils, cooperating teachers, supervisors, and the structure of the school environment. The opposing view of socilization regards the student teacher as an individual adjusting to the school society without deep internal changes in beliefs or attitudes. The implications of these opposing philosophies are discussed with questions on the value of the student teaching experience and their implications for teacher education. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190501

Key Processes in the Socialization of Student Teachers: Limitations and Consequences of Oversocialized Conceptions of Teacher Socialization

Kenneth M. Zeichner
University of Wisconsin, Madison

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kenneth M. Zeichner
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April, 1980.

SP016300

Key Processes in the Socialization of Student Teachers

> The social processes involved in both the formation and maintenance of identity are determined by the social structure. Conversely, the identities produced by the interplay of organism, individual consciousness and social structure react upon the given social structure, maintaining it, modifying it, or even reshaping it...If one is mindful of this dialectic one can avoid the misleading notion of "collective identities" without having recourse to the uniqueness sub specie aeternitatis of individual existence. (Berger & Luchmann 1966, pp. 173-174)

The problem of teacher socialization is one instance of the larger sociological question of the relationships between individuals and institutions. Brim (1966, pp. 3-4) outlines two major interests in this study of personality in relation to society:

> One interest is in how individuals adjust to society and how in spite of the influence of society on them they manage to be creative and to transform the social order in which they have been born. The other is the interest in how society socializes the individual—how it transforms the raw material of biological man into a person suitable to perform the activities of society.

Historically, the study of teacher socialization has fallen into the latter of these traditions.[1] Following Brim's (1966, p. 5) advice that "the inquiry at all times is concerned with how society changes the natural man, not how man changes his society," most studies of the socialization of teachers have fit within this functionalist mode of

inquiry and have emphasized accounts of how the individual adjusts to the constraints of social structure to the neglect of analyses of the individual's role in resisting and in transforming the social structure. In this dominant functionalist view of the socialization process, "Man is portrayed as a relatively passive entity always giving way to socializing forces; an empty vessel to be filled with the basic value orientations and customs of the society of which he will become a part" (Lacy 1977, p. 18).[2]

On the other hand, there have been many recent attempts (e.g., in the area of occupational socialization) to articulate challenges to the strong determinism of the functionalist view by the development of models of the socialization process which go beyond mere assessments of the individual fitting into the institution (e.g., Olesen & Whittaker 1968). These "dialectical models" of the socialization process focus on the constant interplay between individuals and the institutions into which they are socialized (Berger & Luchmann 1966). According to this view, "while social structures are compelling in the construction of identity, the concept of socialization should define people as both recipients and creators of values" (Popkewitz 1976, p. 4). The argument is made that, while people are necessarily constrained by social structural limitations, they at the same time play an active part in shaping their identities, often acting in ways which contradict the dominant norms and values which pervade a social setting. "The institutions of our society are characterized by contradiction as well as by simple reproduction" (Apple 1978, p. 2). Variation in perspectives is seen as a necessary part of the socialization process, and, in fact, it is the

linking of these differential perspectives to specific organizational contexts which becomes the focal point of study.[3]

Given these two major orientations to the study of socialization, an attempt will be made in the present paper to analyze the existing literature on teacher socialization with a particular emphasis on socialization during the most universally acclaimed segment of professional preparation, the student teaching experience. While acknowledging that the socialization of teachers is a career-long process,[4] in fact, a process which has its origins even before the advent of formal training (Lortie 1975), it is felt that both the complexity of the process and the scarcity of studies on socialization subsequent to formal training necessitate a limited investigation at this point in time.

Therefore, an attempt will be made to examine the major explanations for socialization during student teaching with a view toward articulating a model of the socialization process which incorporates but at the same time goes beyond functionalist accounts. This analysis will draw on works from the larger area of occupational socialization and recent analyses of student teacher socialization and will present a dialectical view of teacher socialization which has implications for teacher educators and for future research.

Functionalist Studies of Teacher Socialization

Lortie (1973, p. 486) asserts that "we now stand in the desirable position of having alternative explanations and emphases available" for the socialization of teachers. He then presents four positions on the key processes involved in teacher socialization.[5] They are:

1) An emphasis on early childhood

2) An emphasis on peer influence

3) An emphasis on persons with evaluative power

4) An emphasis on pupils as socializing agents

In addition to the various influences outlined above, three other key processes can be detected in the literature on teacher socialization:

5) An emphasis on lateral roles and the socializing influence of nonprofessional agents

6) An emphasis on the ecology of the classroom

7) An emphasis on the influence of a teacher subculture and the bureaucratic structure of the schools

Studies related to each of these major emphases will now be briefly examined in an attempt to assess the state of our knowledge about the strength and nature of the influence of these various socializing forces.

An Emphasis on Early Childhood

There are two major explanations given for the primacy of early life experiences in teacher socialization. First, Lortie (1966, 1975), in arguing the position that biography as opposed to formal training is the key element in teacher socialization, states, "Socialization into teaching is largely self-socialization; one's personal dispositions are not only relevant, but, in fact, stand at the core of becoming a teacher" (Lortie 1975, p. 79). According to this view, teacher socialization occurs largely through the internalization of teaching models during the thousands of hours spent as a student in close contact with teachers. It is the activation of this latent culture during formal training and subsequent membership in the profession that is the major influence in shaping one's conception of the teaching role and role

performance. Lortie's argument is partly based on several studies where teachers attested to the tangential nature of their formal training and frequently referred to the continuing influence of their earlier mentors. Furthermore, the lack of use of a technical language by these teachers pointed to the continuation of lay imagery into professional practice (Lortie 1975). This emphasis on an "apprenticeship of observation" is also given a prominent place in the analyses of Maddox (1968), Fuller and Bown (1975), and Pruitt and Lee (1978) and receives some support from a study conducted by Petty and Hogben (1980).

Another variant of the early life emphasis is put forth by Wright and Tuska (1968) who argue within a Freudian framework that choice of the profession and subsequent teaching behavior is largely an expression of psychodynamic processes initiated in childhood. Consequently, teaching is seen as the acting out of early fantasies. In both of these views formal training is seen as a "low impact enterprise" which plays little part in altering earlier ideas about teaching.[6] In fact, Lortie (1975, p. 80) even questions the use of the term socialization to describe entry into the teaching role.

> The connotations of the term socialization seem somewhat askew when applied to this kind of induction, since they imply greater receptivity to a pre-existing culture than seems to prevail. Teachers are largely self-made, the internalization of common knowledge plays only a limited part in their movement to work responsibility.

In summary, this position affirms that the prospective teacher is not a tabula rasa awaiting inscription and locates the major socializing influences at a point prior to the advent of formal training experience.

An Emphasis on the Influence of Persons with Evaluative Power

Edgar and Warren (1969) present a theoretical model of teacher socialization which stresses the internalization of values held by sanctioning colleagues. According to this view, socialization is a "power process" in which the neophyte gravitates toward the views held by those with evaluative power over his/her performance. Evidence is then presented based on this model which demonstrates the process with regard to the attitudes of beginning teachers toward various dimensions of teacher role autonomy. While this study focused on beginning teachers as opposed to teachers-in-training, it provides a theoretical rationale for the major thrust in investigations of student teacher socialization: studies of the socializing influence of the cooperating teacher.

As Friebus (1977) correctly points out, most studies of student teacher socialization have attempted to assess the impact of the cooperating teacher as a socializing agent. He attributes this to the fact that the cooperating teacher is the person in closest contact with the student teacher and the one who has the primary responsibility for the student teacher's activities. The literature in teacher education is filled with assertions as to the key position of the cooperating teacher in the socialization of student teachers (e.g., Stratemeyer & Lindsay 1958).

Accordingly, there is a plethora of literature which focuses on the degree of change in student teachers' attitudes and behaviors in relation to those of their cooperating teachers'. For example, there are several studies which demonstrate that student teachers see their cooperating teachers as their most significant socializing agents (e.g., Karmos & Jacko 1977) and others which demonstrate that the

attitudes and behaviors of student teachers shift toward those of their cooperating teachers by the end of the experience (e.g., Scott & Brinkley 1960; Price 1961; Iannaccone 1963; Yee 1969; Roberts & Blankenship 1970, Seperson & Joyce 1973; Zevin 1974). Furthermore, there is some evidence that the influence of the cooperating teacher carries over into the beginning years of teaching (McAulay 1960). These studies typically conclude that because of the high degree of influence exerted by cooperating teachers, training institutions should place a priority on the training of these key agents to support influences desired by the university training program. This author could find only one study, Boschee et al. (1978), which failed to conclude that the cooperating teacher is a major influence in student teacher socialization. However, because of a serious methodological flaw which is felt to be associated with this study, it is concluded that little weight can be given to its findings.[7]

It should be pointed out at this time that, while on the surface the potency of the cooperating teacher's influence seems apparent, in each of the studies cited above the shifting of student teacher attitudes and behaviors toward those of their cooperating teachers was a general phenomenon. In each instance there were some student teachers who did not fit into the dominant pattern. This point will be explored further in a later section of the paper.

The other person with formal evaluative power over the student teacher is the college supervisor. Here, contrary to the findings which demonstrate the strong influence of cooperating teachers, there is little empirical evidence that the college supervisor exerts any substantial influence in the socialization of student teachers. Most studies have concluded that

the college supervisor has little impact in comparison with the competing influence of the cooperating teacher (e.g., Morris 1974; Zevin 1974; Bowman 1978). However, two recent studies have detected specific if somewhat limited influences which supervisors do exert. Friebus (1977) concludes that supervisors play a significant role in "coaching" the student teacher (i.e., providing ideas about what to do in a particular lesson or situation). Also, Tabachnick et al. (in press) found that supervisors played a legitimating role with regard to student teachers' development of utilitarian perspectives on teaching, through a focus on procedural rather than substantive issues in supervisory conferences and seminars. By focusing upon how things are to be done in classrooms, to the exclusion of considering why, the university originated discussions which tended to encourage acquiescence and conformity to existing school routines.

In any case the evidence with regard to the influence of college supervisors is minimal in comparison to that concerning the cooperating teacher's influence. Together, studies of the influence of cooperating teachers and college supervisors are supported by the theoretical framework of Edgar and Warren (1969) and place little or no emphasis on a prospective teacher's predispositions and intentions. The major sources of socializing influence are located within the formal training process.

An Emphasis on Peer Influence

Consistent with Becker et al.'s (1961) conclusions concerning the strong influence of a peer subculture in the process of occupational socialization, a few studies have attempted to assess whether such an influence exists in the case of student teaching. Although there have been relatively few inquiries into this area, studies have demonstrated that other student teachers do play a somewhat limited role in providing emotional support for their peers (Friebus 1977; Karmos & Jacko 1977)

and in acting as indicators of a student's progress toward mastery of the teaching role (Iannaccone & Button 1964; Friebus 1977). Generally, these studies conclude that the peer subculture is not very important because of a lack of opportunities for student teachers to interact in more than limited ways.

An Emphasis on Pupils as Socializing Agents

Lortie (1975) argues that the psychic rewards of teaching come largely from one's pupils rather than from those with formal evaluative power over one's performance. Consequently, it would seem that pupils have a great deal of potential for shaping the behavior of the teacher. This position is consistent with bidirectional models of childhood socialization (e.g., Bronfenbrenner 1973) and has been frequently demonstrated in studies of classroom interactions (e.g., Yee 1968; Brophy & Good 1974; Fiedler 1975). This author could only find one study which attempted to assess the role of pupils as socializing agents during the student teaching experience. Friebus (1977) found that children played an important role in the legitimation of a student teacher's professional identity and in providing the student teacher with a sense of success or failure. These findings led Friebus (1977, p. 266) to conclude that "the pupils are not passive entities to be manipulated by the student teachers, but rather they play an active role in the movement of trainees into the role of teacher." Although there is a scarcity of studies which have investigated this influence with regard to student teachers, Haller's (1966) study of the role of pupils in shaping the sociolinguistic patterns of beginning teachers deserves mention. In this study it is convincingly

demonstrated that pupils exert a powerful influence through a Skinnerian process of operant conditioning on the complexity of a teacher's language use in adult-adult interactions outside of the classroom setting. Primary teachers were found to utilize more complex modes of speech much less frequently than secondary teachers, and the longer time that the primary teachers had spent in the classroom, the less likely they were to use more complex modes of speech. Haller concluded that a teacher's actions are to some extent shaped by repeated interactions with children. To date, no one has tested Haller's ideas with reference to student teachers. This whole area of the reciprocal nature of the teacher-student relationship as it relates to teacher socialization offers a great deal of potential for future research.

An Emphasis on Lateral Roles and the Influence of Nonprofessional Agents

Olsen and Whittaker (1968) define lateral roles as those roles in which a trainee is involved that are not directly a part of the formal socialization process (e.g., husband, father). They then show evidence in the case of nursing students that lateral roles directly influence the formal socialization process largely through the creation of conflicts in time and interests. As was the case in studies of pupils as socializing agents, there is a scarcity of studies which have addressed the impact of nonprofessional agents associated with the lateral roles of student teachers. However, there are two studies which have demonstrated that friends, spouses, dating partners, and relatives exert a limited influence in the socialization of the prospective teacher. Karmos and Jacko (1977) demonstrated that friends, parents, and spouses were influential in

providing personal and emotional support to student teachers. However, Friebus (1977) concluded that spouses and dating partners exert primarily a negative influence on socialization by often making demands on trainees which conflict with formal training obligations. The issue of lateral roles and their impact on the professional socialization of teachers remains largely unexplored at present.

An Emphasis on the Ecology of the Classroom

Fenstermacher (1980) argues that the institutional characteristics of schooling are the most powerful determinants of a teacher's intentions and actions. Important among these characteristics is the ecological environment of the classroom and its impact on the socialization of student teachers. Doyle and Ponder (1975, p. 183) define the ecological system of the classroom as "that network of interconnected processes and events which impinges upon behavior in the teaching environment." According to this view, learning to teach involves "learning the texture of the classroom and the set of behaviors congruent with the environmental demands of that setting" (Doyle 1977, p. 51). The claim is made that these environmental demands establish limits on the range of teacher classroom behaviors and that those behaviors congruent with the ecology of the classroom are more likely to persist than those that are incongruent with the classroom independent of attempts to train prospective teachers in the use of specific skills (e.g., through microteaching) and regardless of the specific model provided by the cooperating teacher (Copeland 1980).

Several researchers have documented the structural characteristics of classrooms that impinge upon the work of the teacher. In addition to Jackson's (1968) now classic work, Life in Classrooms, Dreeben (1973), Sharp and Green

(1975), Doyle (1977) and Dale (1977) all discuss the material conditions of the classroom and how they limit teachers' actions. For example, Doyle (1980, p. 505) outlines five distinctive features of classrooms that to some extent shape the work of the teacher: multidimensionality, simultaneity, immediacy, unpredictability and history. In the 1977 study on which this work was based Doyle studied 58 student teachers over a 3-year period and attempted to delineate the specific teaching strategies that helped these student teachers cope with the complexity posed by classroom environmental demands.

One of the most significant aspects of this rapidly growing area of research is that it has begun to challenge some previously taken-for-granted notions of how student teachers are socialized. As was pointed out above, there is a wealth of evidence indicating that student teachers often move closer and closer to the attitudes and behaviors of their cooperating teachers by the end of the student teaching experience. The most common explanation for this process is that the cooperating teacher is the primary cause of this convergence. However, Copeland (1980, p. 197) argues that "the relationships that have been detected between cooperating teachers and student teachers may be the result of shaping forces exerted on both by the ecological system of the classroom."

While not denying the influence of cooperating teachers on student teachers, Copeland (1980) argues that this influence is mediated by a variety of forces that are not under the direct control of either the cooperating teacher or student teacher (e.g., aptitudes and past experiences of the pupils). Copeland's arguments are supported by the results of a 1978 study in which he conducted a test of this "ecological hypothesis" versus the view that the modeling behavior of the cooperating teacher is the most significant influence

on student teachers. The criterion variable was the student teacher's continued use of a specific skill (asking probing questions) that was taught through microteaching. The results of this study clearly show that the classroom ecological system had a significant effect on the student teachers' continued use of the target skill. "Student teachers who taught in a classroom ecological system accustomed to the use of the target skill were more likely to utilize the target skill than were those students who taught in a system in which the skill was incongruent" (Copeland 1978, p. 98). On the other hand, the model provided by the cooperating teacher had little or no effect on students' continued use of the skill during student teaching.

While studies that examine the impact of classroom ecological systems on student teachers are few in number (Doyle's 1977 study is another good example of this line of investigation), the results which do exist raise serious questions concerning widely held notions of the nature of cooperating teacher-student teacher relationships. However, while these studies more accurately reflect the complexity of student teacher socialization, they still fail to account for the role of the student teacher in shaping the ecological environment of the classroom. While these studies do acknowledge the role of the cooperating teacher in shaping the ecological conditions of the classroom, they still view the student teacher as a passive role performer responding to environmental demands. While there is no denying that the perspectives of student teachers are shaped by the ecology of the classroom, there is a great deal of evidence to be discussed shortly that suggests that this shaping is more partial or incomplete than the ecological studies would lead one to believe.

An Emphasis on the Influence of a Teacher Subculture and the Bureaucratic Structure of Schools

Closely related to the studies emphasizing the influence of persons with evaluative power and those on the ecology of the classroom are a series of studies concerned with the socialization of student teachers toward the dominant beliefs and practices characteristically associated with the bureaucracy of the schools and a teacher subculture therein. Consistent with Becker's (1964) assertion that people will tend to take on the characteristics required by the situations in which they participate (situational adjustment), these studies typically minimize the importance of a neophyte's predispositions (latent culture) in relation to the influence of normative behaviors in school settings. Several of these studies center around the work of Wayne Hoy and his concept of pupil control ideology. Hoy and Rees (1977) define the concept of pupil control ideology along a custodial-humanistic dimension: "A custodial pupil control ideology stresses the maintenance of order, distrust of students, and a punitive moralistic approach to pupil control. A humanistic ideology emphasizes an accepting trustful view of pupils and an optimism concerning their ability to be self-disciplining and responsible."

Based on an assumption that student teachers generally find themselves confronted with a relatively custodial pupil control orientation on the part of experienced teachers, Hoy predicted in several studies that student teachers would be socialized toward a more custodial orientation

by the end of the experience. Accordingly, Hoy (1967, 1968, 1969)

tion by the end of the experience. Accordingly, Hoy (1967, 1968, 1969)

and Hoy and Rees (1977) did find that the pupil control ideologies of student teachers were generally more custodial after student teaching than before. Hoy and Rees (1977) also found that student teachers became significantly more bureaucratic in their views (e.g., more conforming and impersonal) by the end of the student teaching experience. Consequently, Hoy and Rees (1977, p. 25) concluded that "the forces of bureaucratic socialization seem strong and efficient."

Although the results from these studies seem clear and highly consistent, one should be careful in generalizing these findings to all student teaching situations. Two points will be made regarding the limitations of these studies. First, Helsel and Krchniak (1977), in a study which examined the professional and bureaucratic role conceptions of education students and experienced teachers, found, contrary to their predictions, that experienced teachers were less bureaucratically oriented than the education students. This would seem to cast some doubt on the assumption that education students are <u>always</u> confronted with pressures to move toward more custodial and bureaucratic norms. In fact, in each of the studies cited above, there were some students who did not fit into the dominant pattern. The movement toward custodial and bureaucratic perspectives was a general phenomenon and the process of socialization was somewhat incomplete. Whether in fact this was a function of different latent cultures activated during the training experience and/or a result of specific organizational factors is an interesting point for investigation.

Secondly, the studies on pupil control ideology were limited to investigations of the respondents' expressed attitudes. No attempt was made to assess whether trainee ideologies carried over into classroom actions and in what contexts. Keddie's (1971) findings regarding the differences between the educationist and teacher contexts together with much evidence on the occurrence of "impression management" during occupational socialization, to be discussed later, cast doubt on the assumption that there is complete carry-over. In fact, Hoy (1967, p. 264) states that "contemporary social system pressures as well as interpersonal processes probably intervene to reduce the congruence."[8] Mills (1963) has defined this congruence between beliefs and actions as one of the central problems of the social sciences. The examination of pupil control ideologies in relation to classroom actions is a problem warranting further research.

Several researchers have utilized Van Gennep's (1960) concept of "rites of passage" to describe the movement of student teachers into the teaching role (Iannaccone & Button 1964; Willower 1969; Salzillo & Van Fleet 1977; Polansky & Nelson 1980). According to this view, the student teacher, after a process of separation from the student role and a period of transition, is eventually incorporated into a teacher subculture. This position is highly consistent with Hoy's assertions regarding bureaucratic socialization. In both cases, the emphasis is on the situational adjustment of the neophyte to the beliefs and practices supportive of organizational norms. However, while this position on "rites of passage" into teaching has been cogently argued on a theoretical level, there is some empirical evidence which casts doubt on the usefulness of this metaphor for describing teacher socialization. Specifically, while Iannaccone and Button (1964)

were able to apply the notion of "rites of passage" within the boundaries of student teaching, they were unable to conclude that the student teaching experience as a whole functions as a transitional period leading into a stable teacher subculture. The lack of a discrepancy in attitudes between student teachers and experienced teachers on several measures and the movement of student teachers away from the dominant attitudes expressed by experienced teachers or others led them to conclude that "we are inclined to abandon the theory that student teaching functions to initiate members into a teacher subculture" (Iannaccone & Button 1964, p. 28). The term teacher subculture implies a homogeneity of perspectives which does not seem to exist.

In conclusion, while acknowledging that there is much empirical support in addition to that cited above for the assertion that student teachers generally, and to a limited degree, take on the perspectives of their more experienced colleagues (e.g., Horowitz 1968; Coulter & Taft 1973), it cannot be concluded that all student teachers move in more bureaucratic directions. While it may be partially true that "a landmark in one's assimilation into the profession is when he decides that only teachers are important" (Waller 1932, p. 389), it is also true that schools are places for competing ideologies (Anderson 1974) and that there are more than a few teachers who do not fit into the bureaucratic mold (Grace 1978). The processes of teacher socialization are characterized by differentiation as well as by homogeneity.[9]

A Synthesis of the Functionalist View of Teacher Socialization

Lortie (1973, p. 488) correctly concludes that the process of teacher socialization is "undoubtedly a complex process not readily captured by

a simple, one-factor frame of reference." The studies cited above clearly indicate that there are a variety of forces contributing to induction into the teaching role.

While the emerging trend toward viewing teacher socialization as a multifaceted process has been a definite improvement over the previous emphasis on single-factor solutions, the emphasis is still on the student teacher as a relatively passive entity adjusting to outside forces. The issue of internalization is not problematic. In the case of studies emphasizing biographical factors the student teacher is a slave to the past, while in studies emphasizing social structural elements, he/she is a slave to the present. In neither case is the trainee seen as an active force contributing to his/her own socialization.

The following section will delineate some of the specific limitations seen in the functionalist position. Then, an alternative and more dialectical model of teacher socialization, which reduces the pervading emphasis on situational determinism found in the literature, will be presented. The functionalist perspective has contributed much to our understanding of the process of teacher socialization, but it has failed to account for the variations in teaching perspectives which are an inevitable result of the process. As Apple (1979) points out, any theory of socialization must be able to account for the rejection of norms. The very existence of a norm implies and even creates the possibility of its violation (Durkheim 1938).[10]

A Critique of the Functionalist Perspective on Teacher Socialization

Wrong (1961), in a widely cited critique of the then dominant functionalist orientation in sociological literature, characterized an emphasis on situational adjustment with a corresponding neglect of individual autonomy as an "over-socialized concept of man." The emphasis on the plasticity of the individual which served as the target for Wrong's (1961) polemic is clearly represented in the studies on teacher socialization cited above. There is much evidence within the literature of occupational socialization which supports Wrong's position and which casts doubt upon the adequateness of a functionalist perspective on teacher socialization. For example, Olesen and Whittaker (1968, pp. 6-7) describe a position of "soft determinism" which is becoming more and more prevalent in studies of occupational socialization.

> Students in professional socialization are subordinate to their teachers in the role arrangements of the professional school. The faculty roles, after all, are those in which the institution and the profession invest the authority and responsibility to pace, order and sanction the progress of the aspirants to the profession. It is, however, possible to grant this aspect of the organizational arrangements and at the same time to recognize that young people who take the student role, unlike the submissive zombies of our caricature, do in fact shape the role and take an active part in their own education.

There is much evidence from studies of socialization into the medical professions and limited evidence from recent studies on student teacher socialization which supports this view. First, consistant with

Goffman's (1959) theories concerning the prevalence of "impression management" in social interactions within organizational settings, several studies have found that neophytes actively control the images that faculty have of their performance. Beginning with Becker et al.'s (1961) description of the "academic perspective" characteristic of doctors-in-training, the evidence is clear that students seek cues as to the kinds of performances which will be valued by faculty and then actively engage in the desired behaviors even when they are not part of an internal belief system (Davis 1968; Olesen & Whittaker 1968; Bucher & Stelling 1977). Rosow (1965) has characterized this situation of behavioral conformity without supporting value commitment as "chameleonism" and argues that it is the modal condition in adult socialization. The following quote from Bucher and Stelling (1977, p. 109) illustrates this process with regard to the interactions of psychiatric residents and their clinical supervisors during case conferences. "The most common tactic was that the resident psyched out what the supervisor wanted to hear and presented his material accordingly. The resident did not expect to gain anything positive from these encounters, but simply to please the supervisor sufficiently to minimize friction."

Becker et al. (1961, p. 296) argue that the existence of this academic perspective is an inevitable part of the process of professional socialization.

> Insofar as faculty members have some influence on the fate of students beyond the fact that what a student learns in school may affect his life in some way, insofar as the faculty can hurt students by giving them low grades or bad recommendations,

> we may expect that students will respond by attempting first of all to impress the faculty with what they have learned. Teachers commonly complain about this, but they should realize that it is probably an inevitable, though unintended, consequence of the power they wield over students through the use of examinations and grades.

There is also some evidence that "fronting" between supervisors and students is an integral part of the student teaching experience and that student teachers, to some extent, define the situations in their supervisory interactions (Shipman 1967; Sorenson 1967; Gibson 1976; Lacey 1977; Tabachnick et al., in press). For example, Lacey (1977, p. 93) presents an example of what he considers a common strategy employed by student teachers when faced with the often conflicting demands of cooperating teachers and college supervisors:

> The teacher-tutor (cooperating teacher) was, of necessity, more in favor of audiovisual methods than the E-tutor (college supervisor). This simply meant that in practical terms one used those aspects of the method in class which produced the best response and discussed the impossibility of the entire exercise with the E-tutor.

The very fact that neophytes engage in this process of presenting a favorable image to superordinates is evidence that the socialization process is not totally complete. Students, while necessarily constrained by social structural forces, actively shape their existential situation, thus expressing some control over the direction of socialization efforts. The behavioral conformity which is evident in studies of a functionalist persuasion may often by only a veneer (Shipman 1967).

Another segment of evidence pointing toward the dialectical nature of the process of occupational socialization is the finding that the modeling of mentors is not a global process, but instead is somewhat selective. While much of the literature on the socializing influence of cooperating teachers implies that neophytes indiscriminately and uncritically engage in the practices modeled by their cooperating teachers, there are some indications both in studies of student teaching (Copeland 1978) and in studies of medical socialization (Bucher & Stelling 1977) that modeling is partial and highly selective. Students to some extent contribute to the formation of their own professional identities.

> Trainees selected particular characteristics or traits which they admired and sought to emulate. They selected specific attitudes from a number of different individuals rather than choose someone as a global model. The trainees were clearly being highly selective in the traits they sought to emulate; other characteristics of available models were ignored, considered irrelevant, or evaluated negatively (Bucher & Stelling 1977, pp. 151-152).

Because of the formal sanctioning powers that cooperating teachers and other superordinates wield over student teachers, it may seem that evaluations and criticisms from these agents would increase pressures toward modeling and play a large part in legitimating the aspirant's claim to the professional role. However, there are data which indicate that trainees place a great deal of emphasis on their own self-evaluations, often discounting criticisms which are contrary to self-assessments. For example, Friebus (1977) found that student teachers frequently

referred to themselves as a major source of legitimation. While the performances of student teachers are continuously being evaluated, students at the same time are also evaluating their evaluators. These student assessments as to the nature and source of criticism often have consequences for the way students respond and play a crucial role in the formation of their professional identities.

According to Bucher and Stelling (1977), as trainees gain mastery over professional tasks, dependency on external sources of validation decrease and self-validation becomes increasingly salient. "Although signals from others were clearly important to trainees, there were no cues more important, more frequently mentioned, than those the trainees derived from looking at themselves" (Bucher & Stelling 1977, p. 166). The tacitness of much of the knowledge base in teaching (Diamonti 1977) would seem to contribute additional pressures toward the selective reception of formal criticism and to increase the significance of self-validation in student teaching. The implication of the existence of self-validation in occupational socialization is that trainees are able to insulate themselves from discrepant feedback and thereby maintain some degree of control over the socialization process.

Closely related to the existence of impression management, selective modeling and self-legitimation in professional socialization is a strategy referred to by Olesen and Whittaker (1968) as "studentship." In employing this perspective, students actively control the level and direction of their efforts to learn, often engaging in activities which contradict what the faculty may wish them to learn. For example, during the clinical years described in Boys in White, medical students directed their efforts

toward those activities which they thought would provide them with the most varied repertoire of experience and the most responsibility for independent action. Frequently, this meant avoiding or de-emphasizing those activities which, although required and valued by faculty, were not seen as consistent with the students' guiding criteria of experience and responsibility (e.g., laboratory reports). The use of study time by students for concentrating only on those items which they thought would be tested also conflicted with faculty desires (Becker et al. 1961).

There are also data in the case of student teaching which point toward an emphasis by trainees on those activities which students and not necessarily faculty see as contributing to professional growth. For example, the finding that student teachers tend to develop utilitarian perspectives on teaching and focus largely on what will work to solve the immediate problem at hand rather than considering the possible ethical and long-range consequences of classroom actions is evidence that this perspective is active during the student teaching experience (Iannaccone 1963; Hooper & Johnston 1973; Popkewitz 1977; Tabachnick 1980; Tabachnick et al., in press). While the lack of opportunities for student teachers to interact with each other probably minimizes the collective nature of the student response, there are probably instances characteristic of a more collective response (e.g., leveling of effort) which exist in student teaching. It would seem that these more collective aspects of "studentship" would most likely be operative in contexts where student teachers do have opportunities to interact (e.g., campus seminars).

So far, most of the evidence which has been presented for the reciprocal nature of the process of teacher socialization has focused on undercurrents which may not be apparent on the surface. There may still be behavioral conformity even with the employment of "impression management," selective modeling, self-validation, and "studentship." However, there are also cases of active and visible resistance during teacher socialization, i.e., overt behaviors which run contrary to dominant and accepted patterns. For example, in each of the previously mentioned studies concerning the socializing influence of persons with evaluative power and the bureaucratic structure of the school, there were instances where students did not conform to the dominant patterns. In every study the statistical analyses examined general trends and ignored the significance of individual cases. Price's (1961, p. 474) comments with regard to his findings are illustrative of the equivocal nature of these studies:

> This study has shown that a considerable change occurred in student teachers' attitudes during the student teaching semester and that there was a tendency for their attitudes to change in the direction of the attitudes held by their respective supervising teachers. On the other hand, a close inspection of the attitude scores showed that the findings were not entirely true on an individual basis.

Study after study on student teaching conducted from a functionalist perspective has indicated that incongruent influences operate in minimizing the statistical correlations representing dominant trends (e.g., Yee 1969). However, because the studies have largely ignored discrepant cases, a

function of their methods of statistical analysis, we have very little information about this process of variation. There is definitely a need for studies which describe the contexts in which student teachers become "deviant" and the visible manifestations and consequences of this deviance. However, there are some exceptions to this lack of attention to the differential nature of student teacher responses. Lacey (1977) describes several examples of student teacher penetrations into social structural limitations. For example, in one extreme instance, student teachers removed a university tutor from a formal power position in a campus seminar and elected their own leader. While concrete descriptions of the deviant behaviors of student teachers are rare, those examples which do exist indicate that some student teachers overtly resist pressures to behave in desired ways.[11]

The final point to be made with regard to the limitations of a functionalist perspective on teacher socialization concerns the frequent assumption of the existence of a uniform teacher subculture into which students are socialized. As was pointed out earlier, there is some empirical evidence that such a homogeneous situation does not exist (Iannaccone & Button 1964). While certain ideologies and practices may clearly be dominant, schools are also places for the confrontation of competing ideologies. While Lortie (1975) failed to find examples of "counter-identifiers," several other studies do indicate that there are those neophytes who come into teaching interested in changing the system rather than being changed by it and that many of these "radicals" often persist (Anderson 1974; Lacey 1977; Grace 1978). A consensus view of the school and of the nature of the teacher's role is clearly inadequate

to describe the conflictful nature of the profession and the changes which have taken place in schooling. As Anderson (1974, pp. 10-11) points out, "There is not an unambiguous image of the teacher with which the recruit can identify. Schooling is presently the subject of a good deal of public dissatisfaction and radical alternatives are now being widely discussed."[12]

What this means for the study of teacher socialization is that there are constant choices facing a teacher-in-training. Teacher socialization is now seen as involving a constant interplay between choice and constraint and the actions of student teachers are necessarily purposeful. The flexibility of the institution is a necessary element in any conception of teacher socialization. Situational adjustment is only part of the process. Contrary to much of the evidence, teachers-in-training are not passive entities totally subject to the vicissitudes of the institution and its representatives. While studies from a functionalist perspective have contributed much to our understanding of the process of teacher socialization, they present only a partial analysis in that they fail to account for both the overt and covert instances of resistance described in the present section. There is a need to extend the already multifaceted functionalist model to account for the autonomy of the individual. As Lacey (1977, p. 48) points out, "too much emphasis has been given to the obvious fact that change occurs, and too little attention paid to the partial and incomplete nature of the change."

A Dialectical View of Teacher Socialization

There have been several attempts to develop models of occupational socialization which are sensitive to the continual interplay between individuals and institutions. These frameworks have been developed both in relation to medical socialization (Bucher & Stelling 1977) and

teacher socialization (Lacey 1977). In the present paper, part of a classification system developed by Lacey (1977) with regard to the socialization of student teachers will be employed to add an additional dimension to the dominant functionalist perspective.

First, Lacey (1977) develops the concept of social strategy, a coordinated set of action-idea systems, to account for the purposeful and differentiated responses of student teachers to social structural and biographical limitations. According to this view, student teachers can potentially engage in three broad categories of responses when faced with the problems of the student teaching experience. They are: (1) strategic compliance, (2) internalized adjustment, and (3) strategic redefinition.

Strategic compliance and internalized adjustment are both subsumed under Becker's (1964) notion of situational adjustment. In the case of strategic compliance, the individual outwardly complies with the demands of the situation but retains private reservations about doing so. This strategy is similar to the "chameleonism" described by Rosow (1965) and is closely linked with the examples of impression management and fronting cited earlier. This is primarily a utilitarian response to situational pressures and is potentially a source of instability in the organization. On the other hand, with the employment of internalized adjustment, the individual complies with the constraints of the situation and believes them to be for the best. While in both cases there is behavioral conformity, it is only in the case of internalized adjustment that there

is an underlying value commitment. Conformity on values and behavior may vary quite independently.

Lacey (1977) then develops the term strategic redefinition to describe the overt instances of deviance which were alluded to earlier. Strategic redefinition exists when the student teacher is actively engaged in trying to change the range of acceptable behaviors within an institution. It is this category of response which most adds the active and creative ingredient to the model of teacher socialization. While Lacey (1977) seems to reserve this term for only those attempts at redefinition that are successful, it is felt here that it would be more useful to broaden the definition of strategic redefinition to include both those attempts which are successful and those which are not. In this way the model can now account for all instances of overt deviance. Obviously, one cannot determine which of the two types of strategic redefinition has occurred until the process has been completed. Furthermore, each of the two varieties of strategic redefinition may lead to different outcomes. For example, if an individual fails in a change attempt, he/she may choose to leave the organization or to engage in one of the strategies of situational adjustment. On the other hand, if the attempt is successful, the behavior would now fall within the range of acceptable responses within the institution.

Each of the three varieties of social strategy is only interpretable in the context of specific situations. Accordingly, there is no need for consistency in a student teacher's responses across situations. The student teacher may engage in different strategies depending upon his/her assessment of the constraints surrounding a situation at a particular

point in time. The important point about the use of the notion of social strategy is that the individual now has some degree of choice in his/her relationship to the social situation. He/she now has the freedom to manipulate the situation while at the same time being constrained by it.

This process of choice in the employment of a social strategy is made possible through an internal dialogue, a process which has been eloquently described by Olesen and Whittaker (1968) and which is supported in part by the basic postulates of symbolic interactionist theory (Blumer 1969) and ethnomethodology (Cicourel 1973). According to these views, the individual engages in a continual process of interpretation of events and in the construction of meanings about those events. He/she then selects an activity partially based on these interpretations and meanings.

With the addition of Lacey's (1977) terminology to the functionalist perspective we now have a more dialectical model of teacher socialization. The multidimensional term of social strategy is substituted for situational adjustment and the possibility exists for investigating the role of the student teacher in resisting and redirecting formal socialization efforts. While there is presently a scarcity of empirical data on the ways in which student teachers influence their agents of socialization and the structural context of their work settings, this does not mean that such relationships do not exist. More studies need to be conducted which examine the bidirectional nature of influence. Rosenfeld's (1969) study concerning the influence of student teachers on their cooperating teachers is a notable exception to this lack of evidence.

Another segment of the dialectical model which warrants comment is the relationship between biography and social strategy. In the presentation of his framework, Lacey (1977, p. 70) recognizes the importance

of this linkage. "It is important to tie the concept of latent culture in with the concept of social strategy. Latent culture provides the basis for but also limits the number of strategies available to an individual in any given situation."

The works of Lortie (1975) and Wright and Tuska (1968) and Coulter (1980) have convincingly demonstrated that biographical factors do play an important role in the choice of social strategies. Additionally, Lacey (1977) shows how a student teacher's choice of an academic major influences his/her subsequent choice of social strategies during the student teaching semester. The choice of a strategy is certainly not made from an unlimited range of possibilities. However, the individual actor, while constrained by both biographical and situational properties, still plays an active role in his/her own professional development. Studies which are able to link the choice of particular social strategies in specific contexts to the influence of biographical factors would provide an important source of information on teacher socialization.

As Wrong (1975, pp. 66-67) points out:

> a cross-sectional, situational view of interaction, important though it is, remains insufficient. We need also a longitudinal, biographical perspective to account for motivational constants that cannot be understood by even the most subtle scrutiny of the interaction situation alone.

While it is felt that the model presented here adds an important dimension to the analysis of teacher socialization, it is not intended as a complete portrayal of the process. For the most part, this model lends itself to studies of the microsystems of teacher socialization. As Bronfenbrenner (1976) correctly points out, any study of ecological environments must include several layers of analysis. Bronfenbrenner (1976, pp. 7-8), drawing on the work of Brim (1975), outlines four

different levels of analysis which must be ultimately included in any complete description of social influence. They are:

(1) the micro-system--an immediate setting in which occupants engage in particular roles for particular periods of time (e.g., the classroom)

(2) the meso-system--the interrelationships among the major settings in which an occupant engages in a role (e.g., the school and the university)

(3) the exo-system--the formal and informal concrete social structures which impinge upon or encompass the meso-system (e.g., State Departments of Education)

(4) the macro-system--the overarching institutions of a culture of which micro-, meso-, and exo-systems are the concrete manifestations (e.g., the economy).

Teacher socialization is most certainly influenced by forces outside of the immediate environments of school and university classrooms. For example, Waller (1932), Geer (1968), and Lortie (1975) have clearly demonstrated how the structure of the profession (e.g., methods of selection, reward structures, status of the teacher in the community) influence the socialization of teachers. While a few attempts have been made to construct multitiered models of occupational socialization (e.g., Bucher & Stelling, 1977), none of these models has encompassed all of the levels mentioned by Bronfenbrenner (1976). Although the extension of the dialectical model of teacher socialization to include intersystem relationships is beyond the scope of the present paper, an adequate description of teacher socialization must ultimately include attention to these factors.

There are clearly reasons why certain ideologies are dominant and even become reified in social settings. How and why reality comes to be constituted in particular ways is an important and to date neglected area for investigations of teacher socialization and requires that one's analysis extend beyond the level of microsystems.[13]

Implications of a Dialectical Perspective on Teacher Socialization

Implications for Teacher Educators

The construction of a broader and a more dialectical model of teacher socialization has many implications for teacher educators and for future research efforts. A few of these will be discussed in the present paper. First, once one acknowledges that student teachers are actively engaged in controlling their professional socialization, even if only to a limited degree (i.e., that resistance to institutional demands is a by-product of socialization efforts), the implicit assumption in many teacher education programs that student teaching and exposure to planned activities in general will lead to desired outcomes becomes problematic. As Tabachnick et al. (in press) point out with regard to student teaching:

> There is no justification for the naive notion that practical school experience must be useful in introducing students to a wide range of teaching abilities. Nor can it be taken-for-granted that the time spent in classrooms will illuminate relationships for students between what teachers do and the purposes and consequences of teaching...Proposals which "solve" problems of teacher education by scheduling more student time in classrooms rest upon the apparently untenable assumption that more time spent in that way will automatically make better teachers.

Student teaching is neither all beneficial in its effects, as the abundant testimonials and the increased emphasis on field experiences would lead us to believe; nor is it merely a process of adapting new personnel into old patterns, as many critics would have us believe. Instead, student teaching and other planned experiences in teacher education inevitably entail complicated sets of both positive and negative consequences from the standpoint of the institution.[14] As Becker et al. (1961) point out, students do not simply become what the socializing institution wishes them to become. Merely exposing neophytes to a series of well-planned and logically consistent activities may often result in students engaging either overtly or covertly in undesirable strategies. The recent emphasis on the application of systems management theories to the planning of teacher education programs (e.g., Hoswam 1971) is an inadequate means for insuring that trainees will develop desired characteristics. On the other hand, the kinds of formative approaches to planning teacher education experiences set forth by Combs et al. (1975) and Dow (1979) recognize the reciprocal nature of the teacher socialization process and are able to account for the trainee's role in shaping his/her own professional identity.

Secondly, supported by studies on the influence of the cooperating teacher, there is a widespread tendency in teacher education today to advocate the increased training of cooperating teachers in the use of sophisticated technologies for the clinical analysis of teaching (e.g., Copeland & Boyan 1975). However, once one accepts the reciprocal nature of the socialization process, it becomes doubtful whether the use of these new technologies without corresponding changes in the structures

of roles and formal power relationships will change any more than the surface structure of supervisory relationships. Although cooperating teachers may gain possession of more complex skills in the analysis of teaching and in communication, they still will be faced with the counterposing pressures of a student culture and with individuals who are able to insulate themselves from undesirable criticism. Even with formal powers largely invested in the roles of cooperating teacher and college supervisor, it is still the student teacher who largely controls the activities of supervision. It would seem that a desirable goal for teacher educators would be to minimize the amount of ritualized behavior that occurs in supervisory relationships so that significant and lasting change becomes more of a possibility. It is very difficult to imagine helping a trainee through the obstacles of professional socialization if the neophyte does not share his/her inner world with the supervisors for fear of retribution. Formal power relationships which presently exist in student teaching seem to minimize the chances for this authenticity in supervisory encounters (Tabachnick et al., in press). Proposals which emphasize the improvement of the interpersonal aspects of the supervisory process while also advocating changes in concrete power relationships toward more collaboration seem to offer much hope in this direction (e.g., Blumberg 1974).

Another practical implication of a dialectical view of teacher socialization is in terms of what teacher educators can do to sensitize teachers-in-training to the numerous choice points which are available during the process of formal training. Tabachnick et al. (in press) conclude that the actions of student teachers are frequently constrained by internal

factors not existing in the concrete social structure. For example, students often justified rather mechanical classroom actions by citing rules and regulations which in fact did not exist. This finding is consistent with Katz's (1974) assertion that many trainees tend to accept the practices they observe as the upper and outer limits of what is possible in classroom practice (excessive realism). Teacher educators should maximize the opportunities for removing such false barriers and for creating what Katz (1974, p. 59) calls "a balance of realism with adequate openness to the range of what is possible." In striving to achieve this balance, teacher educators should accurately portray the conflictful nature of the profession so that students can choose social strategies based on the widest possible range of information. While attempts by student teachers to redefine situations may often fail, at the very least students should be aware that there are competing definitions available. Failure to recognize the contradictions in schooling only serves to perpetuate the status quo. "Teachers who are ill-equipped educationally and professionally to deal with value alternatives may ultimately react by making a firm stand response with no room for dialogue" (Grace 1971, p. 117).

Implications for Further Research on Teacher Socialization

It has become evident from a dialectical perspective on teacher socialization that many of the significant aspects of a teacher's socialization are embedded in the continual human interactions within the process itself. As Olesen and Whittaker (1968, pp. 296-297) concluded after their study of socialization into the nursing profession,

> It was not in the high council of curriculum planners, nor in the skill of the most sophisticated and understanding instructor, nor in the late night cramming for exams that professional socialization occurred. Embedded in the frequently banal, sometimes dreary, often uninteresting world of everyday living, professional socialization was of the commonplace.

This means that, in order for research on teacher socialization to illuminate the heart of the process, it must be able to capture to some extent the existential reality of becoming a teacher. Research designs which focus exclusively on teacher socialization through predefined categories are too inflexible to reveal those aspects of the process which emerge once the research has begun and are bound to be incomplete. The methods of participant observation (e.g., Bogdan 1972) seem especially appropriate for capturing both the inner and outer worlds of a teacher-in-training, especially in combination with the more traditional scientific methodologies.

There is presently a need for many and varied studies of teacher socialization along the lines of some of the more dialectical analyses of induction into the medical professions. Especially useful would be those studies which follow the neophyte from the inception of formal training into the realm of professional practice. To date, few such longitudinal analyses have been carried out with regard to teaching. The task for researchers on teacher socialization is akin to the one outlined by Davis (1968, p. 251) for investigations of occupational socialization in general:

> It remains to follow the lead of Hughes and to generate models of professional socialization that are far more faithful to this picture of thinking, feeling, ever-responding and calculating human actors groping their way through the ambiguities posed by the confluence of their lived pasts and imagined futures; models, in other words, which in their sociological richness and complexity transcend the dominant one available today—that of neutral receptive vessels into whom knowledgeable, expert members of a profession pour approved skills, attitudes, and values.

It is hoped that the present paper has played some part in contributing toward the development of such models of teacher socialization. There is a great deal of exciting work which remains to be done.

References

Anderson, D. S. The development of student-teachers: A comparative study of professional socialization. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1974.

Apple, M. What correspondence theories of the hidden curriculum miss. The Review of Education, 1979, 5, 101-112.

Barnes, B. J., & Ellner, C. Schoolmaking: An alternative in teacher education. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1977.

Becker, H. Personal change in adult life. Sociometry, 1964, 27, 40-53.

Becker, H., Geer, B., Hughes, E., & Strauss, A. Boys in white. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bell, R. A reinterpretation of the direction of effects in studies of socialization. Psychological Review, 1968, 75, 81-95.

Berger, P., & Luchmann, T. The social construction of reality. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967.

Blumberg, A. Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war. Berkeley: McCutcheon, 1974.

Blumer, H. Symbolic interactionism. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1969.

Bogdan, R. Participant observation in organizational settings. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1972.

Boschee, R., Prescott, D., & Hein, D. Do cooperating teachers influence the educational philosophy of student teachers? Journal of Teacher Education, 1978, 29, 57-61.

Bowden, T. On the selection, organisation and assessment of knowledge for teachers: A case study. Education for Teaching, 1972, 89, 12-18.

Bowman, N. College supervision of student teaching: A time to reconsider. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30, 29-30.

Brim, O. Socialization through the life cycle. In O. Brim & S. Wheeler (Eds.), Socialization after childhood: Two essays. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Brim, O. Macro-structural influences on childhood development and the need of childhood social indicators. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1975, 45, 516-524.

Bronfenbrenner, U. A theoretical perspective for research on human development. In H. P. Dreitzel (Ed.), Childhood and Socialization. New York: Macmillan, 1973.

Bronfenbrenner, U. The experimental ecology of education. Educational Researcher, 1976, 5, 5-15.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1974.

Bucher, R., & Stelling, J. Becoming professional. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1977.

Cicourel, A. Cognitive sociology. Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1973.

Combs, A., Blume, R., Newman, A., & Wass, H. The professional education of teachers. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1974.

Copeland, W. Processes mediating the relationship between cooperating teacher behavior and student-teacher classroom performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1978, 70, 95-100.

Copeland, W. Student teachers and cooperating teachers: An ecological relationship. Theory into Practice, 1980, 18, 194-199.

Copeland, W., & Boyan, N. Training in instructional supervision: Improving the influence of the cooperating teacher. In R. Heidelbach (Ed.), Developing supervisory practice. Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1975.

Coulter, F. Effects of student teaching on self perception, commitment and teaching behavior. British Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 6, 21-28.

Coulter, F., & Taft, R. The professional socialization of school teachers as social assimilation. Human Relations, 1973, 26, 681-693.

Dahrendorf, R. Out of utopia: Toward a reorientation of sociological analysis. American Journal of Sociology, 1958, 64, 115-127.

Dale, R. Implications of the rediscovery of the hidden curriculum for the sociology of teaching. In D. Gleason (Ed.), Identity and structure: Issues in the sociology of education. Driffield: Nafferton, 1977.

Davies, B. Social control and education. London: Metheun, 1976.

Davis, F. Professional socialization as subjective experience. In H. Becker et al. (Eds.), Institutions and the Person. Chicago: Aldine, 1968.

Diamonti, M. Student teacher supervision: A reappraisal. The Educational Forum, 1977, 41, 477-486.

Dow, G. Learning to teach: Teaching to learn. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.

Doyle, W. Learning the classroom environment: An ecological analysis. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28, 51-55.

Doyle, W. Research on teaching in classroom environments. In G. Hall, S. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.), Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin, Tex.: University of Texas R&D Center, 1980.

Doyle, W., & Ponder, G. Classroom ecology: Some concerns about a neglected dimension of research on teaching. Contemporary Education, 1975, 46, 183-188.

Dreeben, R. The school as a work place. In R. Travers (Ed.), The second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Dreitzel, H. P. (Ed.). Childhood and socialization. New York: Macmillan, 1973.

Durkheim, E. The rules of sociological method. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Edelman, M. Political language. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Edgar, D., & Warren, R. Power and autonomy in teacher socialization. Sociology of Education, 1969, 42, 386-399.

Eisenstadt, S., & Curelarv, M. The form of sociology: Paradigms and crises. New York: Wiley, 1976.

Fenstermacher, G. What needs to be known about what teachers need to know? In G. Hall, S. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.), Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin, Tex.: University of Texas R&D Center, 1980.

Fiedler, M. Bidirectionality of influence in classroom interaction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67, 735-744.

Friebus, R. Agents of socialization in student teaching. Journal of Educational Research, 1977, 70, 263-268.

Fuller, F., & Bown, O. Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher education. The seventy-fourth yearbook for the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Gibson, R. The effects of school practice: The development of student perspectives. British Journal of Teacher Education, 1976, 2, 241-250.

Giroux, H. Teacher education and the ideology of social control. Journal of Education, 1980, 162, 5-27.

Goffman, I. The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor, 1959.

Grace, G. Role conflict and the teacher. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972.

Grace, G. Teacher, ideology, and control. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.

Greene, M. The matter of mystification: Teacher education in unquiet times. In Landscapes of learning. New York: Teachers College Press, 1978, pp. 53-73.

Geer, B. Occupational commitment and the teaching profession. School Review, 1966, 74, 31-47.

Haller, E. Pupil influences in teacher socialization: A socio-linguistic study. Sociology of Education, 1967, 40, 316-333.

Helsel, A., & Krchniak, S. Socialization in a heteronomous profession: Public school teaching. Journal of Educational Research, 1972, 66, 89-93.

Hooper, D., & Johnston, T. Teaching practice: Training or social control? Education for Teaching, 1973, 92, 25-30.

Horowitz, M. Student-teaching experiences and the attitudes of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1968, 19, 317-323.

Howsam, R. Teacher education and systems. In Systems and modeling: Self-renewal approaches to teacher education. Washington, D.C.: A.A.C.T.E., 1971.

Hoy, W. Organizational socialization: The student teacher and pupil control ideology. Journal of Educational Research, 1967, 61, 153-155.

Hoy, W. The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 1968, 76, 312-323.

Hoy, W. Pupil control ideology and organizational socialization: A further examination of the influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 1969, 77, 257-265.

Hoy, W., & Rees, R. The bureaucratic socialization of student teacher
Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28, 23-26.

Iannaccone, L. Student teaching: A transitional stage in the making o
a teacher. Theory into Practice, 1963, 2, 73-80.

Iannaccone, L., & Button, W. Functions of student teaching: Attitude
formation and initiation in elementary student teaching. Washingto
D.C.: U.S.O.E. Cooperative Research Project No. 1026, July, 1964.

Jackson, P. Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 19

Jersen, P. What is your E.P.: A test which identifies your educational
philosophy. Clearing House, 1972, 46, 274-278.

Karmos, A., & Jacko, C. The role of significant others during the student
teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28, 51-55.

Katz, L. Issues and problems in teacher education. In B. Spodek (Ed.),
Teacher education: Of the teacher, by the teacher, for the child.
Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young
Children, 1974.

Keddie, N. Classroom knowledge. In M. F. D. Young (Ed.), Knowledge and
Control. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.

Lacey, C. The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen, 1977.

Lortie, D. Laymen to lawmen: Law school, careers, and professional socializa-
tion. Harvard Educational Review, 1959, 29, 363-367.

Lortie, D. Teacher socialization: The Robinson Crusoe model. In The real
world of the beginning teacher. Report of the nineteenth annual TEPS
conference. Washington, D.C.: N.E.A., 1966.

Lortie, D. Observations on teaching as work. In R. Travers (Ed.), The
second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Lortie, D. School teacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Maddox, H. A descriptive study of teaching practice. Educational Review, 1968, 20, 177-190.

McAulay, J. How much influence has a cooperating teacher? Journal of Teacher Education, 1960, 11, 79-83.

Merton, R., Reader, G., & Kendall, P. The student physician. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Mills, C. W. Methodological consequences of the sociology of knowledge. In I. Horowitz (Ed.), Power, politics and people: The collected essays of C. W. Mills. New York: Ballantine, 1963.

Morris, J. The effects of the university supervisor on the performance and adjustment of student teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 1974, 67, 358-362.

Olesen, V., & Whittaker, E. The silent dialogue. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Parsons, T. The structure of social action. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1949.

Parsons, T. Individual autonomy and social pressure. Psychoanalysis and the Psychoanalytic Review, 1962, 49, 70-79.

Petty, M., & Hogben, D. Explorations of semantic space with beginning teachers: A study of socialization into teaching. British Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 6, 51-61.

Polansky, S., & Nelson, J. Political restraint in the socialization of student teachers. Theory and Research in Social Education, 1980, 7, 19-34.

Popkewitz, T. Teacher education as a process of socialization: The social distribution of knowledge. Madison, Wis.: U.S.O.E./Teacher Corps, Technical Report No. 17, 1976.

Popkewitz, T. Teacher education as a problem of ideology. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April, 1977.

Popkewitz, T. Teacher education as socialization: Ideology or social mission. A paper presented at the annual meeting of A.E.R.A., San Francisco, April, 1979.

Popkewitz, T., Tabachnick, B., & Zeichner, K. Dulling the senses: Research in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30, 52-60.

Price, R. The influence of supervising teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1961, 12, 471-475.

Pruitt, K., & Lee, J. Hidden handcuffs in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1978, 29, 69-72.

Rex, J. Key problems in sociological theory. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961.

Roberts, R., & Blankenship, J. The relationship between the change in pupil control ideology of student teachers and the student teacher's perception of the cooperating teachers pupil control ideology. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 1970, 7, 315-320.

Rosenfeld, V. Possible influences of student teachers on their cooperating teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1969, 20, 40-43.

Rosow, I. Forms and functions of adult socialization. Social Forces, 1965, 44, 35-45.

Salzillo, F., & Van Fleet, A. Student teaching and teacher education: A sociological model for change. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28, 27-31.

Scott, W., & Brinkley, S. Attitude changes in student teachers and the validity of the MTAI. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1960, 51, 76-81.

Seperson, M., & Joyce, B. Teaching styles of student teachers as related to those of their cooperating teachers. Educational Leadership, 1973, 31, 146-151.

Sharp, R., & Green, A. Education and Social Control. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Shipman, M. Theory and practice in the education of teachers. Educational Research, 1967, 9, 208-212.

Sorenson, G. What is learned in practice teaching? In L. Horton & P. Horton (Eds.), Teacher education: Trends, issues, innovations. Danville, Ill.: Interstate, 1974.

Stephens, J. The processes of schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.

Stratemeyer, F., & Lindsay, M. Working with student teachers. Teachers College Press, 1958.

Tabachnick, B. R. Intern-teacher roles: Illusion, disillusion, and reality. Journal of Education, 1980, 162, 122-137.

Tabachnick, B. R., Popkewitz, T., & Zeichner, K. Teacher education and the professional perspectives of student teachers. Interchange, in press.

Waller, W. The sociology of teaching. New York: Wiley, 1932.

Willower, D. The teacher subculture and rites of passage. Urban Education, 1969, 4, 105-114.

Wright, B., & Tuska, S. From dream to life in the psychology of becoming a teacher. School Review, 1968, 76, 253-293.

Wrong, D. The oversocialized conception of man in modern sociology. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 183-193.

Wrong, D. Human nature and the perspective of sociology. In Skeptical Sociology. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.

Van Gennep, A. Rites of passage. London: Routledge & Kegán Paul, 1960.

Yee, A. Source and direction of causal influence in teacher-pupil relationships. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1968, 59, 275-282.

Yee, A. Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 327-332.

Zeichner, K. The student teaching experience: A methodological critique of the research. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Las Vegas, February, 1978.

Zevin, J. In thy cooperating teachers image: Convergence of social studies student teachers' behavior patterns with cooperating teachers' behavior patterns. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April, 1974.

Footnotes

[1]As Dreitzel (1973) points out, this historical emphasis on a unidirectional model of socialization is also true with regard to the literature in childhood socialization. Recently, several researchers (e.g., Bell 1968; Bronfenbrenner 1973) have challenged this conception of the socialization process and have presented bidirectional models which acknowledge and attempt to explain the child's influence in socializing his/her significant others.

[2]Let it be clear at the onset that the intent of this analysis is not to set up a "straw person" argument against structural-functionalist views of socialization and to reject out of hand the numerous contributions that studies conducted within this perspective have clearly made to our understanding of the processes of teacher socialization. On the contrary, the intent of this paper (especially the latter portion) is merely to attempt to show the need for the correction of an imbalance which has existed in the studies of teacher socialization. The position is taken here that both the structural-functionalist and "conflict" models of society are needed for an adequate understanding of the complexities of teacher socialization. It is the dominance of the structural-functionalist view and the corresponding neglect of "counter models" that is at issue.

[3]See Popkewitz (1976) for a detailed discussion of this point.

[4]Lortie (1959) argues that the most significant influences in professional socialization take place after graduation from a professional school and where role performance is undertaken in a psychologically meaningful context.

[5]Because Lortie examines teacher socialization as a career-long process and the present paper focuses primarily on student teaching, there is some discrepancy in the placing of socializing agents into specific categories. For example, while Lortie assesses the influence of other teachers under the

category of peer influence, the present paper puts classroom teachers into the category of persons with evaluative power.

The studies that are reviewed in this section were selected after a comprehensive review of published works on teacher socialization and include studies conducted in the United States and the United Kingdom. Then, those studies bearing directly on the socialization of student teachers were selected for inclusion in this review. In a few cases, studies that were not directly concerned with student teachers (e.g., Haller 1966) were included when it was felt that their results had important implications for the study of student teaching. Also, on several occasions the review was extended to include unpublished works on student teacher socialization in areas where the published literature was scant.

[6]Stephens' (1967) assertions with regard to "spontaneous tendencies" are also consistent with this emphasis on biographical factors.

[7]Boschee et al. (1978) base all of their findings on a multiple-choice instrument developed by Jersen (1972) to measure different educational philosophies. At no point, neither in the original presentation of the instrument nor in its application by Boschee et al. (1978), is there any information presented about attempts to establish reliability and validity for the instrument. Accordingly, there is no reason to believe that the instrument measures in fact what its users claim it measures. It should also be pointed out that all of the studies listed here pertaining to the influence of the cooperating teacher, with the exception of Iannaccone (1963), are based exclusively upon self-report data gathered through interviews and questionnaires. There have been very few observational studies on the nature of cooperating teacher-student teacher relationships.

[8]Merton et al. (1957, p. 287) define socialization as "the processes by which people selectively acquire the values and attitudes, the interests

and skills--in short the culture current in the groups of which they are or seek to become a member." The profession of teaching is internally differentiated by the selectivity of the acquisition process, a fact which, although recognized by Merton et al. (1957), has been underplayed or even ignored by many studies on teacher socialization.

[9]Sharp and Green (1975) and Grace (1978) also demonstrate that a direct correspondence cannot be assumed between teaching ideologies which exist at a fairly high level of abstraction and teaching perspectives (i.e., coordinated sets of action idea systems) that guide classroom practice in specific situations. Dale (1977) argues that the reason for this contradiction is that the source of teachers' responses lies in the material conditions of their work (e.g., teacher pupil ratio) rather than in the theoretically based propositions. As Fenstermacher (1980) points out, a teacher's intentions "in-use" is not necessarily synonomous with their intentions "in-storage."

[10]This is not to claim that proponents of structural-functionalist views of socialization are unaware of Durkheim's assertion. In fact, Parsons (1962, p. 79), in a response to a critique of the "oversocialized" view of socialization in structural-functionalist theory, clearly states "of course human behavior is not determined by society as against the individual." There is no intent here to impute to structural-functional theorists generalizations to which few of them would actually subscribe. As Davies (1976, p. 38) correctly states, "this view is as silly and dangerous as anything that functional sociology has ever produced." The point is merely that studies of teacher socialization conducted within this general perspective place too great a reliance on a generalized view of humans as conformist creatures and implicitly negate the role of the individual in shaping the direction of socialization processes. As Wrong (1975, p. 62) points out, "by presupposing

implicitly a conformist psychology, we fail to give equal weight to universal motives and mechanisms resisting conformity." Furthermore, as Eisenstadt and Curelarv (1976) point out, this emphasis on humans as "thoroughly socialized role players" was not true of early structural-functionalist works like Parson's The Structure of Social Action. It is only in the later works of structural-functionalism and particularly in studies of teacher socialization that the view of the socialization process has become too one-sided.

[11]Barnes and Ellner (1977) and Dow (1979) also provide examples of overt resistance by student teachers to the institutional requirements of a teacher education program.

[12]The notion of a uniform teacher subculture into which teacher education students are socialized is analogous to the tendency within structural-functional theory to imply that social systems are held together by consensus on prevailing values and institutional arrangements. This emphasis on value consensus within social systems and the corresponding neglect of conflict and coercion has been extensively and effectively critiqued by many conflict theorists (e.g., Dahrendorf, 1958; Rex, 1961). These arguments of conflict theorists are equally applicable to the notion of teacher subculture which assumes value consensus that in fact does not exist. For a summary of the arguments of the conflict theorists, see Eisenstadt and Curelarv (1976).

[13]See Zeichner (1978) for an analysis of the contradictory results in studies related to the student teaching experience.

[14]One important area of research that has attempted to link the microlevel and macrolevel in the study of teacher socialization can be classified under the rubric of the sociology of knowledge and is concerned with ideological biases implicit in the selection and distribution of knowledge for teachers. These studies (e.g., Bowden, 1972; Dale, 1977; Popkewitz, 1979; Giroux, 1980)

argue in part that the knowledge distributed to teachers and the "professional" language of teacher education serve to turn the attention of individuals away from the contradictions in the existing social order and to inhibit reform. See Green (1978) for a discussion of the processes of "mystification" and the education of teachers and Edelman (1976) for a general discussion of the role of language as a mechanism of social control. Popkewitz et al. (1979) discuss the "conservative" role played by research in teacher education that fails to make these existing categories and actions within teacher education problematic.